

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 11, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 17-22, 24-25, 39-41 and 43-44 have been amended and claims 4, 23 and 42 have been canceled without prejudice, leaving claims 1-3, 5-22, 24-41 and 43-59 for consideration claims upon entry of the present amendment. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the entire specification, for example, the paragraphs [00052]-[00054] of pages 22-23. The specification has been amended.

Specification Objections:

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. The specification has been amended to insert related U.S. Patent Application Serial Nos., as shown in the above amendment.

Withdrawal of the specification objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections:

Claims 17-19 and 41 were objected to because of informalities.

More particularly, claim 17 was objected to because of grammatical error. The limitation "... status certification for a video mail message an asynchronous dialog in a video-enabled...", in claims 17, has been amended to the limitation "... status certification for a first video mail message in a video-enabled...".

Claims 18 and 41 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 18 and 41 have been amended to correct their dependencies from themselves to claims 17 and 39, respectively.

Claim 19 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. Claim 19 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 1 to claim 17. Thus, the subject matter of the amended claim 19 is different from that of claim 3, and claim 19 is not the substantial duplicate of claim 3.

Thus, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claims 18, 21-22 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

More particularly, claims 22 and 41 were rejected for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said asynchronous dialog" in line 3. The limitation "said facilitating of said asynchronous dialog" in line 3 has been deleted from claims 22 and 41, respectively.

Claims 18, 21 and 40 were rejected for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said reply" in line 2. The limitation "said reply" in line 2 of claim 18 has been amended to recite the limitation "a reply", and the limitation "said reply" in line 2 of claims 21 and 40 has been amended to recite the limitation "a first reply", respectively. Thus, claims 18, 21-22 and 40-41 are believed to meet the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,233,318 (hereinafter "Picard") for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the Office Action.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite a method for providing a status certification for a first video mail message in a video-enabled communications network comprising: assigning a message identifier for said first video mail message; creating a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event; associating said disposition identifier with said first video mail message; compiling said disposition identifier and said first video mail message identifier to create a status notification in response to a triggering event; storing said status notification in a temporary video mail box, providing an access identifier for accessing said temporary video mail box, wherein an asynchronous dialog is performed among users having said access identifier via said temporary video mail box.

In claim 17, users are given the access identifier for later accessing the temporary video mail box, and the users perform the asynchronous dialog via the temporary video mail box with the access identifier. On the contrary, the temporary storage, in Picard, is for storing a converted message. It is not found in Picard, that the asynchronous dialog is performed via the temporary storage and a subscriber of a unified message system is provided with the access identifier to perform the asynchronous dialog. Thus, Picard does not disclose or teach all the limitations of claim 17.

Accordingly, Picard does not anticipate or render obvious claim 17. Claim 18 depends from claim 17, and thus is believed to be allowable due to its dependency on claim 17.

Withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-23, 26-42, 45-50, 52 and 54-59

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-23, 26-42, 45-50, 52 and 54-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,014,427 (hereinafter "Hanson") in view of Bartholomew, U.S. Patent No. 6,285,745 (hereinafter "Bartholomew") for the reasons stated on pages 5-10 of the Office Action.

Claims 4, 23 and 42 have been canceled without prejudice, the rejection of claims 4, 23 and 42 is moot.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of providing a status certification for a first voicemail message in a telecommunications network comprising: assigning a message identifier for said first voicemail message; creating a disposition identifier in response to a disposition event; associating said disposition identifier with said first voicemail message; compiling said disposition identifier and said first voicemail message identifier to create a status notification in response to a triggering event; storing said status notification in a temporary voicemail box; and providing an access identifier for accessing said temporary voicemail box, wherein an asynchronous dialog is performed among users having said access identifier via said temporary voicemail box.

The Examiner states that Hanson discloses that a sender sends a message to a recipient and the recipient sends a message back to the sender, and the disclosure teaches the asynchronous dialog among user of the telecommunication system. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

In Hanson, the message sent back to the sender is an action type 4 message. The action type 4 message is one of the action message types (which are predefined messages) and is a prepaid reply to the sender's action message. Hanson discloses that a choice is preferred for the action type 4 message. Thus, the action type 4 message is available only if the sender has paid the cost for the action type 4, and is limited one of

the predefined choices. Further, since the action type 4 message is be accessed only by the sender who has paid the cost, it is impossible to perform asynchronous dialog between the sender and recipient of the action type 4 message. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion, in Hanson, for providing the sender or the recipient with the access identifier to access the temporary voicemail box. Thus, Hanson does not teach or suggest the asynchronous dialog of claim 1.

Further, Hanson does not teach the limitation: compiling said disposition identifier and said first voicemail message identifier to create a status notification in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 1. The status notification of claim 1 indicates the status of the message, for example, the deletion of the message or the opening of the message, etc., at that time the triggering event is occurred. On the contrary, the status of the record, in Hanson, indicates a type of a message instead of the status of the message at a predetermined time. For example, the status of record indicates that the message is action message, a conventional voice mail message or a reply to an action message. Thus, Hanson does not teach or suggest the status notification of claim 1.

Bartholomew discloses a switched communications network. Although Bartholomew discloses a mailbox for transferring voice mail or messages to called parties who are not voice mail subscribers, the mailbox is not for performing asynchronous dialog among users having access identifications but merely constituting addresses or addressable storage or memory in the voice mail system storage. Further, Bartholomew does not teach the status notification of claim 1. Thus, Bartholomew does not cure the deficiencies of Hanson.

Accordingly, the combination of Hanson and Bartholomew does not render obvious claim 1, because both Hanson and Bartholomew do not teach all the limitations of claim 1. Claims 17, 20 and 39 are believed to be allowable over the combination of Hanson and Bartholomew for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 7-16 depend from claim 1, claim 19 depends from claim 17, claims 21-22 and 26-38 depend from claim 20, and claims 40-41, 45-50, 52 and 54-59 depend from claim 39. These dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependencies on claims 1, 17, 20 and 39.

Claims 5-6, 24-25 and 43-44

Claims 5-6, 24-25 and 43-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Bartholomew and further in view of Cloutier, U.S. Patent No. 6,459,913 (hereinafter "Cloutier") for the reasons stated on pages 10-11 of the Office Action.

Cloutier discloses a method and apparatus for unified alerting of subscribers in which the subscriber is alerted via one of his available devices of an incoming message. Cloutier simply discloses alerting the subscriber with a unified alerting system, but does not teach the asynchronous dialog between the subscribers of the unified alerting system by using the access identifier. Further, Cloutier does not teach the status notification of claim 1. Thus, Cloutier does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Hanson and Bartholomew.

Accordingly, the combination of Hanson, Bartholomew and Cloutier does not render obvious claim 1. Claims 20 and 39 are believed to be allowable over the combination for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 5-6 depend from claim 1, claims 24-25 depend from claim 20 and claims 43-44 depend from claim 39. These dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependencies on claims 1, 20 and 39.

Claims 51 and 53

Claims 51 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Bartholomew further in view of LaPorta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,014,429 (hereinafter "LaPorta") for the reasons stated on page 11 of the Office Action.

LaPorta discloses a two-way wireless messaging system. LaPorta does not teach an asynchronous dialog performed among users of an AID having an access identifier via a temporary voicemail box. Thus, LaPorta does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Hanson and Bartholomew. Accordingly, the combination of Hanson, Bartholomew and LaPorta does not render obvious claim 39. Claims 51 and 53 depend from claim 39, and thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependencies on claim 39.

Withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: November 6, 2003